



Integrated approach for characterizing and comparing exposure-based impacts with life cycle impacts

Fantke, Peter; Jolliet, Olivier

Published in:
International Society of Exposure Science 26th Annual Meeting - ISES2016

Publication date:
2016

[Link back to DTU Orbit](#)

Citation (APA):
Fantke, P., & Jolliet, O. (2016). Integrated approach for characterizing and comparing exposure-based impacts with life cycle impacts. In *International Society of Exposure Science 26th Annual Meeting - ISES2016*

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



October 9-13, 2016

Abstract book

Tu-SY-G4.3

Integrated approach for characterizing and comparing exposure-based impacts with life cycle impacts

Peter Fantke, *Technical University of Denmark (DTU), Kgs. Lyngby, Denmark*
Olivier Jolliet, *University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, United States*

To address hazardous chemicals in consumer products, chemical alternatives assessment (CAA) is an emerging approach combining hazard and exposure assessment with technical and economic feasibility. Life cycle aspects are typically not consistently considered in CAA, but are relevant to avoid decisions that involve burden shifting or that result in only incremental improvement. Focusing in the life cycle impacts on widely accepted and applied impact categories like global warming potential or cumulative energy demand aggregating several impact categories will lead to underestimations of life cycle emissions of potentially harmful chemicals and their proposed replacements. Hence, an assessment framework is required that is able to account for near-field consumer exposure to chemicals in products during and after product use as well as population far-field exposure to chemical emissions to the environment from product-related processes along the product life cycle. We build on a flexible mass balance-based modeling system yielding cumulative multimedia transfer fractions and exposure pathway-specific Product Intake Fractions defined as chemical mass taken in by humans per unit mass of chemical in a product. When combined chemical masses in products and further with toxicity information, this approach is a resourceful way to inform CAA and minimize human exposure to toxic chemicals in consumer products through both product use and environmental emissions. We use an example of chemicals in consumer products to demonstrate how this matrix-based system offers a consistent and efficient way to compare exposure pathways for different user groups (e.g. children and adults) and the general population exposed via the environment. We further compare toxicity-related outcomes with outcomes from other life cycle impacts to compare the relevance of different impact categories for different consumer product classes. Through our examples, we will show (a) how to align assumptions used in different assessment methods in a manner that can avoid contradictory results, (b) to consistently consider and compare all relevant impacts, thereby avoiding burden shifting that could result from disregarding chemical and product life cycles, and (c) to prioritize the most relevant impacts across all life cycle stages, thereby setting the scene for a “life cycle alternatives assessment” (LCAA).